

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These Remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed October 20, 2005 ("Office Action"). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections of 1-39 for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action sets forth a rejection of each independent claim (i.e., claims 1, 15, 29, 36, 38 and 39) as allegedly being anticipated by Dubats. Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the above amendments these rejections are improper.

As stated in Dubats, the "remote patrol system (RPS)" consists of two physical groups: a base station and one or more remote monitors. Col. 1, lines 39-40. The remote monitor consists of: one or more object sensors, a data log, connecting cables, and a data transceiver. Col. 1, lines 44-45. A base station consists of: a transceiver, a microprocessor-based data processor unit computer, data conversion devices, software code instructions, one or more form of data storage devices, user interface devices, and output devices, all collectively referred to as a computer. Col. 2, lines 20-24.

The data log component of the remote monitor is disclosed as storing "event/date information for subsequent transmission to the base station through a communication link." Col. 2, lines 4-6. The base station computer is disclosed as interpreting "event and date information received from monitored areas ...[i]nterpretation and analysis may consist of merely recording time and duration of intrusion, or may include estimates of speed, size, direction and identifying and classifying the probable nature of each intrusion event with summary words or phrases such as "pedestrian", "automobile", and "truck" and/or icon figures to represent the inferred nature of the object." Col. 2, lines 29-38.

Thus, as disclosed Dubats' disclosed RPS system includes a passive monitoring site that records events and transmits them to a base station where the events are interpreted. No information (other than, perhaps, activation/deactivation and transmit mode signals) is ever provided from the base station to the monitored site.

In contrast, applicants' claims recite features such as "wherein satellite signals received at the subscriber antenna from the processing center carry data to activate an alarm/warning system

at the subscriber location” that are not suggested or disclosed by Dubats. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections are improper and should be withdrawn for at least this reason.

Some of applicants claims recite the term “subscriber” (e.g., claim 36). The Office Action states (page 9) that “the term ‘subscriber’ is interpreted to mean a location associated with the central processing center that is being monitored.” To the extent that applicants understand the Examiner’s interpretation, applicants respectfully object to that interpretation as being incorrect. Applicants respectfully submit that “subscriber” should be interpreted with the plain and accustomed meaning associated with that term and used in applicants’ specification. For example, with reference to Fig. 1, the subscriber location is associated with subscriber antenna 2 (i.e., at the remote location) and the processing center is associated with the provider antenna 10. Therefore, in contrast with the Examiner’s interpretation, “subscriber” should be associated with the remote location and not the central processing center.

For at least the above reasons, applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1, 15, 29, 36, 38 and 39 be withdrawn. Claims 2-14, 16-28, 30-35 and 37 each depend from one of the independent claims and, thus, contain the features recited therein. For at least this reasons the rejections of claims 2-14, 16-28, 30-35 and 37 are also improper and should be withdrawn.


The Office Action also sets forth rejection of claims 2-4, 9, 11-12, 14, 16-18, 23, 25-26, 28 and 30-32 as allegedly obvious in view of the combination of Dubats and Dillion, Taylor, Stadler, Jang and Dohrmann. As discussed above, claims 2-4, 9, 11-12, 14, 16-18, 23, 25-26, 28 and 30-32 contain the same features recited in the independent claims that are not suggested or disclosed by Dubats. Dillion, Taylor, Stadler, Jang and Dohrmann fail to repair the above discussed deficiencies of Dubats and, thus, the combination of Dubats and any of Dillion, Taylor, Stadler, Jang and Dohrmann also fails to disclose or suggest each feature recited in claims 2-4, 9, 11-12, 14, 16-18, 23, 25-26, 28 and 30-32. Furthermore, applicants maintain, and incorporate by reference herein, the previous arguments regarding the lack of motivation to combine Dubats and any of Dillion, Taylor, Stadler, Jang and Dohrmann. For at least these reasons, applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 2-4, 9, 11-12, 14, 16-18, 23, 25-26, 28 and 30-32 be withdrawn.

In the event any variance exists between the amount authorized to be charge to the Deposit Account and the Patent Office charges, please charge or credit any difference to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Respectfully submitted,

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP

By:


Christopher J. Cuneo
Registration No. 42,450 for
Yisun Song
Registration No. 44,487

Dated: April 20, 2006

Hunton & Williams LLP
Intellectual Property Department
1900 K Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20006-1109
(202) 955-1500 (telephone)
(202) 778-2201 (facsimile)
CJC/vrp